UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/532,462	03/22/2000	Oak Abhijit	30566.94US01	7780

22462 7590 03/08/2004		EXAMINER
GATES & COOPER LLP		BLACKWELL, JAMES H
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER		

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2004

GATES & COOPER LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/532,462	ABHIJIT, OAK
	Examiner	Art Unit
	James H Blackwell	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 December 2003*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to the Amendment filed 12/18/2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Morrison ("Sams Teach Yourself MFC in 24 Hours", Copyright 1999).

In regard to Independent Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claims 11 and 21),

Morrison teaches drawing bitmaps using the Microsoft Foundation Classes (MFC) class

CBitmap. This class provides a member function **LoadBitmap ()** that is used to load a

bitmap after a **CBitmap** object is created. To be loaded, the bitmap file (object data in

this case) is inherently stored separate from the **CBitmap** object (instance). Compare

with Claim 1 (and similarly with Claims 11 and 21), *"... storing the object data for the*

object separate from a file containing an instance of the object". Morrison also

teaches that one loads a bitmap by providing a bitmap resource identifier (i.e. pointer to

a file name) to the **LoadBitmap ()** function (p. 162). Compare with Claim 1 (and

similarly with Claims 11 and 21), *"obtaining a request to load the file"*. The

LoadBitmap () function returns a nonzero value if it is successful and zero otherwise.

Compare with Claim 1 (and similarly with Claims 11 and 21), *"... determining if the object data is available"*. Morrison also teaches that after having loaded the bitmap data into the **CBitmap** object, one can paint the bitmap with the assistance of the member function of the CDC class called **BitBlt ()** (see steps involved on p. 162 to do this). Compare with Claim 1 (and similarly with Claims 11 and 21), *"... obtaining the object data and utilizing the object data to display a graphical representation of the object"*.

In regard to dependent Claim 2 (and similarly dependent Claims 12 and 22), Morrison fails to teach *displaying an empty graphical representation if the object data is not available*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have displayed some indication of a missing file providing the benefit of allowing a sequential loading of multiple objects in a graphics application to proceed without error.

In regard to dependent Claim 3 (and similarly to dependent Claims 13, and 23), Morrison fails to teach *storing a universally unique identifier (UUID) with the file to match the object and the object data*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have provided some mechanism through which files might have been uniquely identified, even if it were nothing more than different file names. The benefit would have been to keep track of separate objects within a graphics application.

In regard to dependent Claim 4 (and similarly to dependent Claims 14, and 24), Morrison fails to teach *storing a reference to the object data in the file*. However, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to

have stored a reference of some sort to data in the file because it would have been

convenient to do so thereby eliminating the need to have to have passed that

information to the object every time it was requested.

In regard to dependent Claim 5 (and similarly to dependent Claims 15, and 25),

Morrison fails to teach that *the reference is a uniform resource locator (URL)*. However,

it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to

have used a URL as a reference because it was one way, especially having been in a

web environment to have directed software to data on a server.

In regard to dependent Claim 6 (and similarly to dependent Claims 16, and 26),

Morrison fails to teach that *the object data is stored on a secure server*. However, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to

store data securely providing the benefit of preventing theft of proprietary materials.

Morrison also fails to teach that *the determining if the object data is available further*

comprises determining if the request to load the file provides proper access permissions

for the object data. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of invention to have secured the data by using a mechanism such as a

username and password providing the benefit of only allowing authorized persons

access to data.

In regard to dependent Claim 7 (and similarly to dependent Claims 17, and 27)

Morrison fails to teach that *the request to load the file originates from outside of a*

network where the data object is stored. However, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have requested a file through a

mechanism such as a phone line and modem. The benefit of such an arrangement

would have been to allow someone wishing to access files but not having had a direct

network connection to obtain said files. Morrison also fails to teach that *the object data*

is not available because a network security mechanism determines that the request

does not provide the proper access permissions. However, it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have denied access to

anyone who would have tried to access a site containing proprietary data without having

had the proper authorization providing the benefit of only having allowed authorized

persons access to data.

In regard to dependent Claim 8 (and similarly to dependent Claims 18, and 28),

Morrison fails to teach that *the separate location is on a supplier's network and a*

supplier maintains and updates the object data. However, it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have stored files at a

commercial site whereby the provider could maintain and update such things as

inventory, prices, etc. The benefit would have been that a customer would have always

had access to the latest information on a given product.

In regard to dependent Claim 9 (and similarly to dependent Claims 19, and 29),

Morrison fails to teach that *utilizing the object data occurs in real time across a network.*

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to have offered real-time use of data over a network because it would have

avoided maintaining files (especially large ones) at the user's site providing the benefit of increased storage space on the user's machine.

In regard to dependent Claim 10 (and similarly dependent Claims 20, and 30), Morrison. teaches that the file is a bitmap (p. 162). Morrison does not specifically teach that *the file is a drawing*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have assumed that the bitmap was of a drawing providing the benefit of having displayed a rendering of a drawing in the form of a bitmap image. Morrison also teaches that a **CBitmap** object contains a bitmap (p. 162). Morrison does not specifically teach that *the object is a drawing component*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have assumed that the **CBitmap** object would have been part of a larger image providing the benefit of creating and maintaining multiple drawing objects. Morrison also teaches that a bitmap is a rectangular grouping of pixels (p. 161, Figs. 9.6, 9.7) that can be loaded into a **CBitmap** object. Morrison does not specifically teach that *the object data provides the graphical representation of the drawing component*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have assumed that once having been loaded into an object, that the bitmap would have been used as a graphical way of representing a part of a drawing.

In regard to dependent Claim 31 (and similarly to dependent Claims 33, and 35), Morrison fails to teach that *the object data comprises content for a document*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention for the object data to represent something that would have been presented to a user on a

graphical device providing the benefit of having been able to view a document on a graphical device.

In regard to dependent Claim 32 (and similarly to dependent Claims 34, and 36), Morrison fails to teach that *the object data comprises formatting information for displaying the object*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have placed formatting information in the object data because it would have eliminated the need to having provided it at some other point preventing the loss or error in the input of such information.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 703-305-0940. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

James H. Blackwell
03/05/04

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER